

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 12-19, 26 and 27 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 3, 4, 14, 15, and 27 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-2, 12-13 and 26. Applicants also believes that claims 3 and 14 are allowable if their §112 rejections are overcome, as claims 3 and 14 depend from allowed claims 1 and 12, respectively.

Applicants also thank Examiner Zhou for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during April 15, April 23 and July 6 telephone interviews. The reasons presented at the interviews as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interviews.

During the April 15 and 23 telephone interviews, Applicants' representatives responded to the Examiner's request for clarification of the term "not" recited in claims 3, 4, 14, 15 and 27. However, after further review of the application, Applicants believe that the current language in claims 3, 4, 14, 15 and 27 is accurate and is fully supported in the specification as discussed in detail below. Nevertheless, to assist the Examiner's understanding of these claims, claims 3, 4, 14, 15 and 27 are amended for clarification without changing or narrowing the claim scope. During the July 6 telephone interview, the Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments to the claims would overcome at least the outstanding §112 rejection.

The Office Action requests amendment to the specification to replace reference to Attorney Docket Nos. with the corresponding patent application nos. The specification is revised as suggested. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 3-8, 14-19 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the limitation "the arbitrary portion not

being positionally corresponding to the second selectable element" in claims 3, 4, 14, 15 and 27 is not positively recited in the specification. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

This language is amended for further clarification to recite "another portion corresponding to a position different from the second selectable element." As discussed during the July 6 interview, this is supported in the specification at paragraphs [0053] and [0111]. Specifically, lines 6-10 of paragraph [0053] describes that "selectable elements may correspond to selectable elements that were present in the original document, such as hyperlinks to documents or to other portions of the same document..." That is, selectable elements (e.g., first selectable elements) are provided to the thumbnail. The selectable elements correspond to selectable elements, such as hyperlinks, provided in the original document (e.g., second selectable elements). The selectable elements provided in the original documents (e.g., second selectable element) are linked to another portion of the original document or another document. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the "another portion" corresponds to a position different from the selectable element provided in the original document (e.g., second selectable element).

Moreover, lines 8-11 of paragraph [0111] describe that a direct positional correlation between the selectable elements (e.g., first selectable element) and the corresponding areas of the document (i.e., position corresponding to the second selectable element) is not required. In addition, for example, if the original document is a four-page document, the thumbnail may be provided with four selectable elements, each corresponding to a different page. Therefore, if the recited first selectable element that appears on the bottom of the thumbnail showing page 1 of the original document is selected, page 4 of the four-page document may appear, instead of the bottom portion of page 1 of the original document. This also supports the claims as amended.

Therefore, as agreed during the July 6 interview, the phrase "another portion corresponding to a position different from the second selectable element" recited in the rejected claims are well supported in the specification. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 7-8, 15, 18-19 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,751,287 to Hahn et al. (Hahn). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, that a first selectable element has, as an associated destination, one of (a) another portion of the original document accessible by selection of a second selectable element provided in the original document and (b) a document other than the original document, and that the another portion corresponds to a position different from the second selectable element.

The Office Action asserts that Hahn teaches that the user can directly select a portion of the thumbnail page and in response, the selected portion of the page is displayed, by (referring to col. 11, lines 48-56 and col. 12, lines 24-28).

According to these sections and as shown in Figs. 16 and 17, Hahn provides a thumbnail view of each page of a document in thumbnail regions 1710 and 1770, respectively. The user may select a portion of a thumbnail (allegedly corresponding to the first selectable element) to display the corresponding section of the selected page of the document (Fig. 16) or the whole page of the selected thumbnail (Fig. 17) (allegedly corresponding to the second selectable element), in the document view regions 1720 and 1790, respectively. However, as discussed during the July 6 interview, Hahn does not teach or suggest displaying another portion of the original document, which corresponds to a position different from the second selectable element, that is accessible by selection of the second selectable element provided in the original document or a document other than the original document, as recited in claim 4.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentably distinct from Hahn. Claims 15 and 27 recite features similar to those of claim 4. Accordingly, claims 15 and 27 are also patentably distinct from Hahn. Dependent claims 7-8 and 18-19 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable claims 4 and 15, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.


The Office Action also rejects claims 5-6 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hahn in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,192 to Brown et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-6 and 16-17 are allowable at least for their dependence on allowable claims 4 and 15, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8, 12-19, 26 and 27 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:SPC/tls

Date: July 18, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--